



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/718,531

11/24/2003

Beatrice Perron

235208US0

1996

22850

7590

12/11/2009

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/11/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/718,531	Applicant(s) PERRON ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory R. Del Cotto	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 11/20/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-17, 19-21 and 24-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-17, 19-21 and 24-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6, 10-17, 19-21, and 24-29 are pending. Claims 7-9, 18, 22, 23 and 30 have been canceled. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 11/20/09 have been entered.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/20/09 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejections as set forth in the Office action mailed 8/24/09 have been withdrawn:

None.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1796

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1796

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 13-17, 19-21 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofrichter et al (US 2003/0108501).

Hofrichter et al teach a shampoo composition containing 5 to about 50 percent of a surfactant, at least about 0.1 weight percent of particles having a mean particle size of less than about 300 microns, at least about 0.05 weight percent of a cationic polymer, and at least about 20 weight percent of an aqueous carrier. See paras. 10-14. The particles have a particle size from about 0.01 microns to about 80 microns and suitable particles include magnesium aluminum silicate, calcium carbonate, etc. The particles are present in no more than 20% by weight. See paras. 53-57. Additionally, the shampoos of the composition may contain a suspending agent in amounts from about

Art Unit: 1796

0.1% to about 10% by weight and suitable suspending agents include polyacrylamide, polyethyleneimine, etc. See para. 192 and 193.

Hofrichter et al do not teach, with sufficient specificity, a composition or method of using such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition and use such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Hofrichter et al suggest a composition and method of using such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 1-6, 10-17, 19-21, and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutierrez et al (US 5,955,415).

Note that, upon further consideration, and consistent with the instant specification on pages 7 and 8, the Examiner asserts that the instant claims require particles containing mixtures of at least 50% by weight calcium carbonate and other inorganic compounds or simply just particles of calcium carbonate and the calcium carbonate as

Art Unit: 1796

taught by Gutierrez et al would fall with the scope of the instant claims. Further, “wherein the particles comprise at least 50% by weight of calcium carbonate” does not refer to the amount of calcium carbonate contained in the composition but rather, calcium carbonate must be present in an amount to satisfy the recited ratio.

Gutierrez et al teach detergent compositions, essentially free of chlorine bleach compounds, containing a surfactant, builder, enzyme, peroxygen bleach and from about 0.001% to about 5% by weight polyethyleneimine or salts thereof. These compositions exhibit controlled and improved bleaching action on stains as well as improved storage stability, fabric safety and whitening/brightening characteristics. See Abstract. Suitable detergent builders include crystalline aluminosilicate builder materials which have a particle size from 0.2 to 4 microns. Additionally, other detergent builders include seeded builder mixtures having a 3:1 mixtures of sodium carbonate and calcium carbonate having 5 micron particle diameter. The builders comprise from about 5% to about 80% by weight of the composition. See column 13, line 65 to column 17, line 60. The polyethyleneimines suitable for use have the same general formula as recited by instant claims 7 and 18. The polyethyleneimines are suitable for use in a variety of compositions including shampoos, conditioning shampoos, etc. See column 44, line 60 to column 45, line 10.

Gutierrez et al do not teach, with sufficient specificity, a composition and method of using such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition and use such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success and similar results with respect to other disclosed components, because the broad teachings of Gutierrez et al suggest a composition and method of using such a composition to clean/condition hair containing solid mineral particles, at least one polyalkyleneimine, and the other requisite components of the composition in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofrichter et al (US 2003/0108501) as applied to claims 1-6, 13-17, 19-21, and 24-29 above, and further in view of Gutierrez et al (US 5,955,415).

Hofrichter et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, Hofrichter et al do not teach the use of the specific polyethyleneimine as recited by the instant claims.

Gutierrez et al are relied upon as set forth above.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the specific polyethyleneimine as recited by instant claims in the composition taught by Hofrichter et al, with a reasonable expectation of success, because, Gutierrez et al teach that specific polyethyleneimines as recited by the instant claims are useful in shampoo compositions and further, Hofrichter et al teach the use of polyethyleneimines in general.

Response to Arguments

With respect to the rejection of the instant claims under 35 USC 103 using Hofrichter or Gutierrez, Applicant once again states that nothing in Hofrichter or Gutierrez teaches, suggest, or recognizes any benefits associated with actually combining PEI and solid mineral particles in a shampoo or a rinse-out conditioner in the specific ratio as recited by the instant claims. Further, Applicant states that the Examiner has not provided any evidence or scientific reasoning to supports its conclusion that the applied art teaches using the specified compounds in the specified amounts and in fact, has recognized that the applied art does not teach such subject matter. In response, note that, in the Office action, it does make the statement that neither Hofrichter nor Gutierrez teaches the claimed invention with sufficient specificity. However, this is synonomous to stating that the teachings of Hofrichter or Gutierrez are not sufficient to anticipate the claimed invention but nevertheless, the teachings of Hofrichter or Gutierrez are sufficient suggest the claimed invention and render the claimed invention obvious under 35 USC 103. Note that, with respect to the weight ratio of PEI to mineral particles as recited by the instant claims, Hofrichter teaches the use of 2% by weight of mineral particles (i.e., calcium carbonate – see paras. 51-57 of Hofrichter) and 0.1% by weight of polyethyleneimine (See paras. 191-193) resulting in a ratio of 0.02 which would fall within the scope of the instant claims. Additionally, Gutierrez et al teach the use of 0.001% to about 5% by weight of polyethyleneimine (See Abstract of Gutierrez) and 5% by weight of calcium carbonate (See column 14, line 1 to column 17, line 20 of Gutierrez) such that a composition containing 0.1% of PEI

Art Unit: 1796

and 5% by weight of calcium carbonate would result in a ratio of 0.02 which would fall within the scope of the instant claims. Thus, the Examiner maintains, as stated previously, that Hofrichter teaches the use of PEI as a suspending agent in a shampoo composition in conjunction with solid mineral particles in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims.

Furthermore, while Hofrichter or Gutierrez may not use PEI in combination with solid mineral particles for the same reason as Applicant, the reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. Note that, while there must be motivation to make the claimed invention, there is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972). See MPEP 2144. While Applicant has once again cited a Board decision in Whalen to support a position that where the parameter optimized was not recognized in the prior art as one that would affect the results, these parameters cannot be optimized in the applied art, the Examiner asserts that the facts of Whalen are different from the instant case and that each of Hofrichter et al and Gutierrez clearly teaches the use of PEI in combination of calcium carbonate in the specific amounts as recited by the instant claims. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the teachings of Hofrichter or Gutierrez are sufficient to render the claimed invention obvious under 35 USC 103.

Additionally, Applicant once states that the previously submitted three Rule 132 Declarations are sufficient to rebut any prima facie case of obviousness by showing the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention in comparison to compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims. Also, Applicant once again states that in these Declarations, compositions which were virtually identical except for the amount of polyethyleneimine and solid mineral particles present were compared and compositions falling within the scope of the claimed invention provided improved hair smoothness properties.

With respect to the Declarations filed under 37 CFR 1.132 which were submitted on 11/8/07 and 7/27/06 and the new 132 Declaration submitted on 5/12/09, the Examiner maintains, as stated previously, that these Declarations are not sufficient to show the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention in comparison to those compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims. Again, note that, while Applicant has provided data with respect to four, single embodiments falling within the scope of the instant claims (ratios of 0.005, 0.0031 and 0.0027, 0.04), the data presented in the Declarations is not commensurate in scope with the instant claims. The instant claims broadly recite "solid mineral particles comprising at least one element selected from the group consisting of columns IIa, IIIa, and IVa of the Periodic Table of the Elements wherein the particles comprise at least 50% by weight of calcium carbonate" and at least one polyethyleneimine wherein the composition has a particle weight ratio of polyethyleneimine/mineral particle of 0.05 to 0.001, while the Declarations provide data and evidence with respect to only four specific embodiments

Art Unit: 1796

of the claimed invention which is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. Furthermore, only compositions containing calcium carbonate and two specific polyethyleneimine (Lupasol G35 and Lupasol FG) are presented in the Declaration(s) while the instant claims are open to particles containing mixtures of calcium carbonate with many other inorganic compounds and any polyethyleneimines of any molecular weight. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the 132 Declarations are not sufficient to show the unexpected and superior properties of the claimed invention in comparison to those compositions falling outside the scope of the instant claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory R. Del Cotto/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/G. R. D./
December 4, 2009